

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

*Status of the Claims*

Claims 2, 4, 6, 14 and 15 are pending, with Claims 2, 4 and 6 being independent. Claims 8 and 10-13 have been canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 2, 4, and 6 have been amended. Claims 14 and 15 have been added. Support for the new claims and claim changes can be found in the original disclosure, such as in Figs. 1, 7, 10-12, and 14-16, and the accompanying disclosure, and therefore no new matter has been added.

*Request For Acknowledgment*

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge the claim for priority and receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents filed on April 20, 2006.

*Formal Claim Rejections*

Claims 4 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, and Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In response, while not conceding the propriety of the rejections, Applicants have canceled Claim 10 without prejudice and amended Claim 4 to address the points raised in the Office Action. Applicants submit that as amended, Claim 4 now even more clearly satisfies 35 U.S.C. § 101. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the formal rejections be withdrawn.

### *Substantive Claim Rejections*

Claims 2 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0105983 (Brakmo et al.). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brakmo et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0178987 (Chen et al.). Claims 8-13 were rejected under 35 US.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brakmo et al. in view *Mastering Microsoft Office 97* (hereinafter referred to as Mosley).<sup>1</sup> In response, while not conceding the propriety of the rejections, Claims 8 and 10-13 were canceled without prejudice, thereby rendering moot the rejection of these claims, while the rejection of Claim 9 is improper since it was previously canceled. Applicants submit that remaining Claims 2, 4, and 6 are allowable for the following reasons.

Amended Claim 2 recites, in part, a control unit configured to control an information apparatus to provide a reminder of a schedule that has not yet been given to a user when the time interval between the time at which the power supply is powered ON and a predetermined time in the past is not greater than a predetermined time interval, and configured to control the apparatus not to provide any reminder of the schedule that has not yet been given to a user when the time interval between the time at which the power supply is powered ON and the predetermined time in the past is greater than the predetermined time interval.

By this arrangement, when the apparatus is turned off sufficiently long for many scheduled reminders to become due, and when the apparatus is then turned on, the oldest reminders, which may no longer be relevant to the user, are not given to the user, thereby preventing the user from being overwhelmed by a large number of reminders, some or many of which are no longer relevant, when the apparatus is turned on.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants assume that the inclusion of Claim 9 in this rejection is an error, since Claim 9 was previously canceled.

In contrast, the citations to Brakmo et al. and Chen et al. are not understood to relate to an apparatus that, when turned off sufficiently long for many scheduled reminders to become due, provides only the most recent reminders to the user when the apparatus is then turned on, thereby preventing the user from being overwhelmed by a large number of reminders, some or many of which may be no longer relevant, when the apparatus is turned on.

Accordingly, the citations to Brakmo et al. and Chen et al. are not understood to disclose or suggest providing a reminder of a schedule that has not yet been given to a user when the time interval between the time at which the power supply is powered ON and a predetermined time in the past is not greater than a predetermined time interval, and not providing any reminder of the schedule that has not yet been given to a user when the time interval between the time at which the power supply is powered ON and the predetermined time in the past is greater than the predetermined time interval, as recited by amended Claim 2.

The Office Action cites the Brakmo et al. for its disclosure of the control unit recited in Claim 2. However, this publication is understood to merely relate to a conventional computing device that enters a sleep state before the next scheduled event and wakes up prior to this event to reduce power consumption. Applicants can find no disclosure addressing the providing of reminders to a user when those reminders are scheduled during the sleep state according to a predetermined condition. Therefore, it is not surprising that that Applicants can find no disclosure of providing a reminder of a schedule that has not yet been given to a user when the time interval between the time at which the power supply is powered ON and a predetermined time in the past is not greater than a predetermined time interval, and not providing any reminder of the schedule that has not yet been given to a user when the time interval between the time at

which the power supply is powered ON and the predetermined time in the past is greater than the predetermined time interval, as recited by amended Claim 2.

Since amended Claim 2 recites at least one feature not understood to be disclosed or suggested by the applied art, Applicants submit that the Office has not yet satisfied its burden of proof to establish the anticipation of or a *prima facie* case of obviousness against amended Claim 2 over the applied art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 2 be withdrawn. And because corresponding method Claim 4 and medium Claim 6 have been amended in a corresponding manner, they are allowable for corresponding reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 4 and 6 be withdrawn. Moreover, new independent Claims 14 and 15 recite features similar to Claims 2 and 4 and are therefore allowable for similar reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that Claims 14 and 15 also be allowed.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable, due to their dependency from the independent base claims, as well as due to additional features that are recited. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

### *Conclusion*

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are allowable over the art of record, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the application are earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1205.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gary M. Jacobs/

---

Gary M. Jacobs  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 28,861

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
1290 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10104-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
GMJ/klm